

# Potential Group Membership/Voting Changes for CERS Regulator User Group

*Prepared by Cal/EPA Unified Program November 29, 2010 (Rev.1)*

While ideally decisions/votes made by the CERS Regulator User Group membership would hopefully be made by consensus or large majorities, there may be times where the Group's member vote counts will need to be individually tallied.

Currently there are more CUPA members than specified in the Group's charter (22 versus 15) and fewer PA members (6 versus 15 authorized). During the Group's Nov. 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, a motion was approved to "limit the count during a vote to one from an agency with more than one voting member when the total number of voting members exceeds 15 for a represented group (CUPAs or PAs)." However, Cal/EPA staff has determined this is not an administratively feasible approach.

Listed below are several potential options for revising the group's charter for membership and voting. One of these needs or some other specific proposal must be adopted by Group as soon as possible.

Option # / Name	Description	Pros (↑) and Cons (↓)
<b>1. Expanded Current Membership</b>	Expand voting membership to 25 CUPA members. All future new and replacement members would be approved by majority vote of voting members present at a meeting. Decisions made by majority vote of <b>members</b> present at a meeting.	↑ Minimal change from status quo. ↓ Some CUPAs currently over-represented. ↓ Somewhat increases CUPA membership ratio. ↓ More long term work to determine specific members/alternates.
<b>2. One vote for each UPA</b>	Each UPA would have a single vote. Decisions made by majority vote of <b>UPAs represented</b> at the meeting.	↑ Simplest model to manage. ↑ Easier to manage members/alternates (only one per UPA) ↑ All CUPAs/PAs can participate in decisions if they wish ↓ PA vs. CUPA membership ratio somewhat decreased. ↓ State vs. UPA membership ration decreased. ↓ Longer voting roll calls.
<b>3. UPA Proportional Representation</b>	Voting "members" would be a subset of UPAs proportion to their total counts. A 25% proportion would result in 21 representative CUPAs and 9 representative PAs. Each representative UPA would have one vote toward decisions. Decisions made by majority vote of <b>UPAs represented</b> at the meeting.	↑ Fewer voting members than Option 2 ↑ Easier to manage members/alternates (only one per UPA). ↑ Shorter voting roll calls. ↓ Not all UPAs can participate in decisions. ↓ How do we initially decide who the representative UPAs are? ↓ Possibly not enough PA participation to fill all seats.